REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. The Office has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office has also rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Elliott et al. (US 2002/0064149 A1). This Office action is non-final and is responsive to Applicant's communication filed on October 11, 2001.

112 Rejections of Claims 1-22

Applicant has either amended the claims in response to the 112 rejection or has replied to the rejection below. All claim amendments in this reply are responsive to the 112 rejections and were not made to overcome prior art.

Applicant does not understand the Office's rejection of claim 3 stating that "one of the third set of groups" (line 28) lacks antecedent basis. The "third set of groups" is introduced two lines earlier in claim 3.

102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 10, and 20

Elliott does not show or suggest "initiating one or more database sessions in response to one or more user logons," as required by Applicant. The passage cited by the Office teaches a "user authentication between the PC Client and the server [that] is negotiated during the dial-up logon session." This teaching does not embody the elements of Applicant's claim. Instead, it describes a PC Client accessing a web server over a dial-up connection to the Internet. The only session that is disclosed is a "dial-up logon session" which is a common method used to authenticate a dial-up user and allow or deny the user access to a network. However, a "dial-up logon session" is not the same as a "database session," the former being a method to control access to a network for a dial-up user and the later being a method to control access to a database. Elliott simply does not teach database sessions at all, and more specifically he does not teach initiating one or more database sessions in response to any type of event, let alone to one or more user logons. Elliott therefore fails to explicitly or impliedly teach all the elements of Applicant's claimed invention.

(NCR-9884)

Elliott also does not show or suggest "initiating tasks in response to commands received from a database session," as required by Applicant. The Office cites the same passage as above and adds the comment "from interface after logon." As shown above, a logon session is not the same as a "database session." Furthermore, Elliott does not show or suggest "initiating tasks," whether in response to a logon session or in response to commands from a database session. Elliott fails to anticipate all the elements of Applicant's claimed invention and, therefore, the 102 rejection is improper. Applicant's claims are allowable over this reference.

Rejection of Dependent Claims

Dependent claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as their corresponding independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's claims are allowable over the prior art made of record. Applicant asks the Office to reconsider this application and allow all claims. Please charge any fees that might be due, excluding the issue fee, or credit any overpayment to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5-3-2005

Harden E. Stevens, III
Reg. No. 55,649

NCR Corporation
1700 South Patterson Blvd.
Dayton, Ohio 45479

(803) 939-6505
(803) 939-5099 (fax)